

REMARKS

Both the specification and the Abstract have been objected to because of the lack of proper idiomatic English. With respect to the specification, the Examiner has required a substitute specification. With respect to the Abstract, the Examiner has requested that it be reviewed and edited.

An amended Abstracted is included above at pages 5 and 6.

With respect to the Examiner's requirement for a substitute specification, applicants have instead amended all of the relevant portions of the specification in the foregoing Amendment and in a manner that is believed to properly describe all of the important aspects of the invention as recited in the amended claims. In particular, paragraph [0013] of the SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION on pages 3 and 4 has been substantially amended to describe the invention in proper idiomatic English. Likewise, paragraphs [0026] - [0028] of the SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION have been amended to describe important aspects of the invention as claimed in proper idiomatic English. Finally, paragraphs [0054] and [0057] of the DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS have also been amended consistent with the revised SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

In all of the foregoing amended paragraphs, no new matter has been added. It is believed that the essence of the invention is clearly described in the revised paragraphs and, as a result, a complete rewriting of the specification is unnecessary.

With respect to the drawings, the Examiner has suggested that Figure 5 should be designed with a legend such as --PRIOR ART--. Applicant concurs and a replacement sheet for original Figure 5 is enclosed with the appropriate prior art legend added to it.

The Examiner has also recited a number of claim objections and has required appropriate correction. All of these objections have been addressed in the amended claims above.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite. In claim 1, line 5, use of the term "and/or" is found to render the claim indefinite. This term has been deleted in the amendment to claim 1.

In claim 1, lines 10-17, the Examiner has suggested that the term “opposite” is being used incorrectly and makes the limitations presented unclear. The Examiner has suggested use of the word “distal” in certain instances. Applicants concur, but as shown in amended claim 1, applicants have adopted the term “proximal”, but used that word in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Applicants wish to note that the word “proximal” is used consistently in the amended paragraphs of the specification.

The Examiner has indicated the allowability of claim 1, subject to amendment to overcome the §112 rejections. Claim 2 has also been indicated as allowable if amended to overcome the §112 rejections and to include all limitations of base claim 1. The allowability of claims 1 and 2 is also contingent upon correction of the claim objections identified above.

Applicants have made every attempt to address all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action. Claims 1 and 2 as amended herein are now believed to be in condition for allowance and are fully supported by an amended specification that includes no new matter. Therefore, allowance of the application is believed to be in order and further favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP



Joseph J. Jochman
Reg. No. 25,058

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 271-7590
Attorney Docket No: 488-00063

Appln. No. 10/698,239
Amdt dated: October 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2004

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet includes the addition of PRIOR ART to Figure 5. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Figure 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet